

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 and 10-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 16 are cancelled. Claims 2, 4-7 and 10-15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In light of the amendments to the claims and the accompanying remarks applicant earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration.

On the Merits

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Okada* (US Patent 6,928,229); claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okada*; claims 7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okada* in view of *Takahashi et al.*; claims 8/1-8/6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okada* in view of *Peker et al.*; claim 8/7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okada* in view of *Peker*; and claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being anticipated by *Okada*. Favorable reconsideration of these rejections is earnestly solicited.

Independent Claims 2, 4-7 and 10-15

In the response filed on August 25, 2006, applicant argued that *Okada* did not disclose the required features on independent claim 1, specifically:

a compressor for compressing each of the image signals inputted by said inputter into a second size which is equal to or smaller than $1/N$ (N : integer) of the first size....

The Examiner cited to column 3, lines 17-27 which he contended disclosed the above required feature. In response to the Examiner's position, applicant noted that *Okada* simply appears to disclose image compression, but not "*into a second size which is equal to or smaller than $1/N$ of the first size,*" as required by independent claim 1.

It was noted that in the preamble of independent claim 1 it stated that the image signals were recorded on a medium on which "*a plurality of unit recording zones each of which has a first size.*"

Thus, independent claim 1 requires a compression and recording of an image signal into a recording zone of a second size which is equal to or smaller than $1/N$ of the first size (of the image recording zone).

In the Examiner's response to arguments, he indicated that "[i]mages can be compressed in to a second size of $1/N$ and also n can be changed for compression purposes." Page 2 of the Office Action. The Examiner contended that the " n " can be changed, therefore changing the image compression.

However, applicant asserts that *Okada* does not disclose compressing the image signal into a second size *which is equal to or smaller than 1/n of the first size*, where the first size is the size of a unit recording zone. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is not giving full weight to the size requirement mentioned above of independent claim 1. The Examiner appears to be focusing on the compression requirement, but not compressing the image signal into a specific size, namely smaller than 1/N of the first size.

Because *Okada* does not disclose or fairly suggest this feature, applicant respectfully submits that the claims as herein presented are in condition for allowance. In particular, claims 2 and 4-7 have been rewritten into independent form. Each of these claims contains the features of claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Furthermore, claims 10-15 are rewritten into independent form to include the features of claim 9. The claims are further distinguished as discussed hereinafter.

Independent Claim 2:

In the response dated August 25, 2006, applicant argued that *Okada* did not disclose the features required in dependent claim 2, specifically the feature of:

said recorder includes a **searcher for searching unit recording zones** each of which is in a vacant state.... Emphasis added.

Applicant asserted that neither the Examiner's cited passages, nor the rest of the *Okada* reference disclosed the above required feature.

In response, the Examiner states that “*Okada* discloses ID information with image information. The user can easily search recording zones through ID to find out the information to retrieve or to record information if the area is vacant.” However, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not shown the above required feature of a recorder which includes a searcher for **searching unit recording zones** as required by dependent claim 2.

It appears that the Examiner may be considering the “user” to be the “searcher.” However, claim 2 specifically requires “said recorder includes a searcher.” Thus a user who conducts a search cannot disclose what is required by claim 2.

Dependent Claim 3 and Independent Claim 11:

Dependent claim 3 and independent claim 11 each require “a restorer for restoring said link [information].” The Examiner contends this feature is disclosed by *Okada* in column 4, lines 37-50. However that passage of *Okada* simply seems to only discuss recording an image onto a magnetic disc. *Okada* does not disclose any “restoring” feature, as presently required by the claims. Thus, because *Okada* does not disclose a “restorer for restoring said link [information]” as required by the claims, applicant respectfully seeks withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims as herein presented.

Independent Claim 9:

Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Examiner's cited passage of *Okada* or any other part of *Okada* discloses a "unit recording zone" as required by independent 9 (and the other above mentioned claims). The "unit recording zone" feature, which was described on page 7 of the response submitted on August 25, 2006, and is further described in the present specification on page 2, is a feature that is not disclosed or fairly suggested by *Okada*.

The Examiner contends this feature is disclosed by *Okada* in figure 1 by "magnetic disk"

32. Independent claim 9 specifically requires:

a holder for holding a recording medium *on which a plurality of unit recording zones each of which has a first size are formed....* Emphasis added.

The emphasized portion of independent claim 9 is not disclosed by the cited passage of *Okada*. As the Examiner is interpreting *Okada*, the "magnetic disk" is the recording medium as required by independent claim 9. However, according to the Examiner's interpretation, the magnetic disk must also have a plurality of unit recording zones, **each of which has a first size**, as required by claim 9. *Okada* does not disclose or fairly suggest this feature. If the rejection is maintained, applicant requests the Examiner specifically address this feature. As such, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Amendment After Final
Application No. 10/076,532
Attorney Docket No. 020191

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned agent to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Stephen G. Adrian
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,878

Dennis M. Hubbs
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 59,145
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SGA/DMH/tw